DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 836 FL 008 228

AUTHOR Jacobson, Rodolfo
TITLE Teaching Strategies for the Education of Bilinguals.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (10th, New York, New York, March 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; *Bilingual Students; English; Instructional Materials; Language of Instruction; Language Usage; Sociocultural Patterns; Sociolinguistics; Spanish; *Spanish Speaking; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Code Switching (Language)

ABSTRACT

Bilingual education, the objective of which is to render bilingual a group of monolingual or quasi-monolingual speakers, is distinguished from the "education of bilinguals," whose goal it is to teach the content of school subjects through the medium of two rather than one language. The present paper establishes this distinction and justifies the differential status of the two types of bilingual instruction on the basis of sociolinguistic, socio-cultural and psychological considerations. To establish the independent status of the "education of bilinguals," an innovative design for a bicultural and bilingual program is proposed that will lend itself to implementation in any area of the U.S. where stable bilingualism is operative, particularly South Texas. A set of token materials appropriate for such a program are provided, materials that will make ample use of "code-shifting" techniques that are sociolinguistically and psychologically significant and would better help the students relate to the classroom, since such strategies are part of their everyday verbal behavior. It is concluded that bilinguals will perform better if they are allowed to carry their usual bilingual strategies in to the classroom and are allowed to retain as well as distribute their two languages in a functionally significant way. (Author/CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132836

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHING STRATEGIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF BILINGUALS

Rodolfo Jacobson, Ph.D.
University of Texas at San Antonio

0. The term "Bilingual Education" is used by the professionals of education to identify an innovative instructional method of reaching the child whose language and culture loyalties differ from those of the majority child. The term lends itself to a gamut of different interpretations depending upon the individual's particular bias. A person's sociological, cultural, linguistic or educational orientations hold very specific implications for teaching the child bilingually and are all responsible, one way or another, for the variable interpretation of the concept. It is one of the objectives of the present paper to explore what "bilingual education" means and which conceptualization has greater relevance for the American Southwest. Other objectives of the paper are to carefully examine the optimum distribution of the two languages and to finally suggest a somewhat controversial approach of using the Bilingual's two languages concurrently and this in response to certain cues to which the teacher can only react if he succeeds in recognizing them during her verbal interactions with the child in, as well as outside of, the classroom.

These cues require, to be understood, illustrative items or samples of verbal interaction between a teacher and her students in order to show how the transition from one to the other language is made. For the development of some of these items, the author is grateful to his students at the University of Texas and to a group of three cooperating bilingual teachers of the Alonso Perales School, Edgewood School District, City of San Antonio, Texas, who not only provided several of these items but also tested them in their classes.[1]

FL008228

(1) Cooperating in the project were Mr. Perez, Ms Rangel and Ms Rubio, all bilingual teachers of the Edgewood School District, San Antonio, Texas.

1. Theodore Andersson and his associates list in their two-volume study of Bilingual Schools in the United States the following specific objectives of a bilingual program:

> To plan and conduct the program in such a way that either language, or both, is used for most effective learning in any of the curriculum.
>
> To encourage all children, each at his own best rate, to cultivate their first language fully. . . . .
>
> To encourage all children to develop fully their second language, each at his own best rate of learning.
>
> To enable all children to gain a sympathetic understanding of their own history and culture and of the history and culture of the ethnic group. (1970:69)

The same general idea with its focus on bilingualism and biculturalism is also present in Joshua Fishman's broad definition when he argues that

> in very general terms, bilingual education implies some use of two (or more) language of instruction in connection with teaching courses other than language per se.....(However) wherever courses such as mathematics or history or science (or Bible or Talmud) are taught via a language other than English, while other courses (such as mathematics or history or...) are taught via English, then bilingual education may be said to obtain. (1975:39-40)

but, on the other hand, he admits that

> (however,) within this broad definition it is obvious that vastly different types of programs and program goals can be and are being pursued. (Ibid)

What can be deduced from these statements as to what should be taught in a truly bilingual program? For "most effective learning in any part of the curriculum" to take place, the different subject areas must obviously be taught in "either language, or both." This part of Andersson's statement however, seems to conflict somewhat with the objective stated later "to encourage all children to develop fully their second language, each at his own best rate of learning." If the child needs language development of this sort, beyond his normal dose in either language, he may have to be exposed to second language instruction first, say, ESL or SSL, since a major

deficiency in the second language would prevent him from functioning satisfactorily in a class where the content is taught fully or in part in a language which he does not know well. The teaching in "both" languages, as briefly suggested by Andersson, seems to conflict to some extent with Fishman's argument that bilingual education pertains when some subjects are taught in one language and others in the second language. As a matter of fact, he does not suggest at all the possibility that a given subject may be taught using concurrently the two languages as medium of instruction.

These conflicts are not shortcomings in Andersson's and Fishman's arguments but rather one that emerges from the term itself which can be viewed in a variety of different ways. And in fact, you can find a large number of bilingual education programs which only stress, during a short period of time, the language development ingredient without ever getting to the teaching of content in the two languages. Thus, "bilingual education" at times turns out to be merely a euphemism for ESL, SSL or whatever the second language may be. On the other hand, if an emphasis on the development of second language skills becomes unnecessary because the children already possess a fair degree of competency in the other language, then -- to follow Fishman's argument -- we divide the curriculum into two parts, a set of courses to be taught in Language A, say, English, and another such set to be taught in Language B, Spanish. How to justify the language choice is no small problem because it is almost impossible to anticipate that the child would actually deal with matters related to, say, math always in language A and with those related to history or geography in language B. The splitting of the curriculum into two on the basis of language mya bring to our minds the distribution of the two languages by virtue of domains (Fishman, 1970) but as all school subjects fall into the same educational domain, this notion hardly qualifies here.

If , in turn, we wish to avoid any arbitrary decision concerning the distribution of the two languages, we may decide to teach all subjects by using the two languages concurrently. More shall be said about this approach below. As for "bilingual education" in general there seems to be a consensus as we have seen above that the teaching of content, and not the development of a second language constitutes the teaching objective of a bilingual program. This goal can only be set aside temporarily when the teacher or the school becomes aware of the fact that the child's knowledge of his second language is so negligible that no learning of content could possibly be achieved if he were taught in his weaker language. Bilingual education, then, in terms of what is to be taught falls into three subclassifications:

1. Second language developments
2. Certain subjects in one and other subjects in the other language; and
3. All subjects in both languages.

There is no clear reference in either one of the earlier statements in regard to who is to be taught. Andersson refers to all children but Fishman disregards the issue, at least in the quoted statement. Does all children now mean all American children or is it all children in a given geographic area of the U.S. where the ethnic distribution of the school population strongly suggests that all children should become bilingual for the benefit of better mutual understanding. In the same chapter of the cited study, Andersson remarks that

> So far American schools have put all their effort into fitting the child to the language of the school. We ask now whether a better way may not be to fit the language of the school, at least in part, to the child (1979: 72),

an observation that leads us to believe that his concern is geared to specific geographic areas where the child's language is either not English or not

Standard English, otherwise why should one want to "fit the language of the school, at least in part, to the child". (Cf. above) Whether this is what Andersson had in mind or what Fishman left unsaid, it is a fact that bilingual education, in regard to who is to be taught, tends to differ widely in the extent to which the two languages actually co-exist in the community. As a matter of fact we may wish to make a distinction between two types of bilingual education, one that holds for areas that are basically monolingual and another for bilingual and/or diglossic areas. Let us call the first type plainly bilingual education and the second one education of bilinguals, in view of the fact that in the former case we teach bilingually to promote acculturation and socio-economic mobility, whereas in the latter we strive for linguistic and cultural balance in an attempt to solve some of the problems brought about by the tugs and pulls in an area where two ethnic groups seem to fail finding a common denominator for their cultural and linguistic aspirations. In most of the Southwest, parts of New York City, Canadian-U.S. border areas, Indian reservations and surrounding areas, it is the education of bilinguals that we ought to pursue which requires a different school-community network not to be found where the acculturation -- or assimilation -- goal pertains. In "bilingual education" the term all children addresses itself to all those who need both languages to make the transition that permits them to fully function in an only English-speaking society as well as to those others who, in view of the pluralistic nature of our society wish to partake in a program of this sort. All children in the "education of bilinguals," on the other hand, refers to children who, because of their immediate environment, have acquired bilingual skills and are expected to further use those skills in order to socially interact with peers and non-peers. It is this population that we have mainly in mind when we think of bilingual education in, say, South Texas, New Mexico and

other areas of the Southwest and to a far lesser degree the one that seeks cultural and linguistic enrichment for its monocultural and monolingual children. Who is to be taught, then, distinguishes the children who are bilinguals from those who would try to become bilinguals. It also distinguishes the children who wish to remain bilinguals from those who do not. This fourfold distinction can be visualized as follows:

	MONOLINGUAL	BILINGUALS
Language Development	ESL/SSL ⟶ Enrichment ⟶	x
Bilingual Education	⟵ Assimilation ⟵	TRANSITION
Education of Bilinguals	x	Biculturalism MAINTENANCE ↓

Table 1

This distribution strongly suggests that we should envision "bilingual education" as a general concept but must make a more precise interpretation contingent, not only upon those whom the bilingual program is trying to reach, but also what the ultimate goal is going to be, i.e., loss or retention of bilinguality.

The next question that we now wish to consider is who is teaching in a bilingual program? The various programs in operation provide us with a whole array of possibilities from teachers to teaching aides, from teams of monolinguals to bilinguals, from teams of a monolingual with a bilingual aide to teams of bilingual teachers with a monolingual aide. The great variety of these combinations seems to suggest that the designers of bilingual programs are still uncertain about the qualifications that a good bilingual teacher should possess. Here again, the distinction between "bilingual education" and "education of bilinguals" seems to be to the point. For the former, it appears that a team of two monolinguals, say, one English-speaking and

one Spanish-speaking teacher, may be adequate, since either transition or enrichment is here the goal, whereas for the latter the single bilingual teacher is preferable because she can serve as a model of bilingual functioning. This further implies that we must distinguish between the teacher who only is a bilingual and one who actually teaches bilingually. One can find a number of bilinguals who should rather teach in one language, usually English, because -- inspite of surname and ethnic background -- they have already progressed too far along on the assimilation scale toward the dominant culture to generate the type of bilingual climate that is the prerequisite for a successful program for bilinguals. The preparation of bilingual teachers, at least of those who are to educate bilinguals, is not a simple additive process by which the training in pedagogy and the learning or prior knowledge of the other language necessarily yields an efficient bilingual teacher. Neither an in-service training workshop nor a few graduate courses will help her acquire bilingual competency unless she already shares, intuitively, the belief in the equality of the two cultures and languages and in the necessity to assist the children to cope with both in a new world of co-existence.

The methodological question brings us back to an earlier issue. Andersson has the following to say about language distribution:

> The goal [of "mixing" the languages or move freely from one to the other throughout the day] is to achieve a 50-50 time distribution. This unfettered arrangement has two very great attractions: it mixes all children from the start, and it requires only one set of teachers. . . . . The possibilities for equal treatment in all subject areas seem to be much greater (in N AND K2), with progressively more

(2) Nye School of the United Independent School District outside Laredo, Texas and John F. Kennedy Community School in West-Berlin, in both of which concurrent teaching methods are being implemented. (cf. Jacobson, 1975, and Mackey, 1970)

> programs as one moves up through the grades. . . . . The chief difficulty, as far as time is concerned, is in actually achieving the desired time distribution in all subjects and activities. It is hard to keep track of how much each language is really used for what. In addition, the bilingual teacher is almost inevitably stronger in E in some domains and in X in others and this is likely to tip the balance now one way and now the other. . .(1970:100)

Obviously, despite their mentioning the option of using "both" languages as medium of instruction in the statement of specific objectives, Andersson and his associate are reluctant to subscribe to it. Their argument is not entirely convincing as the failure of achieving a 50-50 distribution can easily be balanced out at other times such that a 30-70 distribution on one day can be followed by a 70-30 distribution on the following day, when the topic is more appropriate for using the other language. The greater proficiency in the use of one language in certain domains[3] only prevails as long as the speaker makes no conscious effort in expanding his competence, -- usually only lexical competence, -- in another domain.

To avoid the "dangers of language mixing," Andersson recommends that the teacher

> seriously consider setting aside specific portions of time for each language rather than "mixing" them freely throughout the day. Such a division does have what some teachers consider to be a drawback: a child's interest and curiosity may at a certain moment suggest a question that he hesitates to voice if the language being used at the time is his weaker means of communication. The loss can be minimized if children are made to feel that the division between the portions of the day is not unviolable - that there is never a time when the use of their mother tongue would be morally wrong - and only that the goal is to use each language at its own separate time. (1970: 102)

Whether minimized or not, the loss would be there and the rationale for the restriction of the two languages to more or less unflexible time slots would

(3) The author is here using <u>domain</u> as Andersson has done in his study. His interpretation differs from Fishman's, for example, in that it is not the societal construct which tries to identify the congruency of language choice in regard to specific social institutions but the more general idea of subject area.

not counteract the loss, if there were one. Bilingual learning does not necessarily take place in the language of instruction but rather in either one of the bilingual's languages. Rudolph Troike, in a recent lecture[4], confirmed this notion of bilingual information-processing when he reported on several testing results that showed that the academic achievement of Mexican-American bilinguals had been found to be comparable to that of Anglo-American monolinguals when the former were tested in both languages and the correct responses in both languages were combined to determine students achievement level. If this is actually the case, there seems to be little sense in keeping the two languages artificially apart in a classroom situation. Furthermore, it appears highly questionable that such

> attitude [to use each language at its own separate time] developed in children will help them to come to see that there are times and places when each language in turn is preferable to any other, and to develop a sense of which situations are which, and why. (Ibid.)

The author is not questioning here the importance of developing in the children a feeling of language appropriateness but only the assumption that the latter can be achieved by assigning specific time slots to, say, English and Spanish. Since all school subjects fall into the same domain, i.e., education, it will be difficult to make children rationalize that science is best associated with English and social studies, with Spanish. If transferred to another bilingual program, the same student may run into the opposite pattern: science is to be identified with Spanish and social studies, with English. The only generalization, then, that the child can legitimately arrive at, if English is used from 8:30 to 11:00 and Spanish, from 12:00 to 2:30 would be that it is appropriate to speak English in the mornings

(4) Rudolph Troike, "Linguistics and Bilingualism," lecture delivered at the 1975 Bilingual Summer Institute at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

and Spanish in the afternoons rather than the other way around, a most trivial deduction.

The preceding discussion has addressed itself to the question how the teaching is done and one may summarize it by saying that we may encounter, in our bilingual programs, two differential approaches in regard to the distribution of the two languages, (1) the language-separating approach and (2) the concurrent approach but that only the former distinguishes between two different rationales for its implementation, one that is content-oriented and the other that is time-oriented, viz.

(1) the language-separating or language-specific approach
    a. content-oriented
    b. time-oriented

(2) the concurrent approach.

To some extent, the author not only considered here the question how the teaching is done but also why it is done this way, since the method cannot meaningfully be separated from its underlying rationale. Reasons usually given for separating the two languages would go like the following:

(1) To mix the two languages in the teaching of any subject matter tends to confuse children;

(2) To develop language competence in the weaker language, the teacher must restrict herself to using that language alone when teaching content in that language;

(3) To split the time between Language A and Language B by resorting to a more or less fixed pattern warrants a 50-50 distribution of the two languages; to the contrary, there is no assurance in language balance because teachers vary in the extent to which they know and use the two languages;

(4) One language lends itself better to the teaching of certain areas of content than others, e.g., the ethnic language is more appropriate to teach social studies, since historical, geographic and cultural aspects of the ethnic group will usually be discussed there, whereas the dominant language handles more adequately the science-related subjects like math, science and health;

(5) The student must learn that during certain times of the day it becomes necessary for him to speak the language of the home but during other times he will use the language of the broader population; as a result of this, it is useful to set up time slots during which only one language and other time slots during which only the other language shall be spoken.

Three of these arguments seem to mainly have language development in mind (1, 2, 3), whereas the remainder focuses on the need for a viable distribution of the two languages (4, 5), either on the basis of what is taught (content) or when it is taught (time). My own position (cf. footnote 2), is accounted for in William Mackey's study Bilingual Education in a Binational School where he devotes an entire chapter to the "Bilinguality of the Instruction." Mackey is well aware of the fact that the concurrent approach is a controversial issue when he argues that

> Some persons see only disadvantages in this continual alternation between languages, claiming that it confuses the children and hinders their mental development. Others can see nothing but advantages, especially when a repetition of the same things in the other language reinforces that redundancy which is essential to all communication. (1972:69)

However, Mackey strongly supports the concurrent approach himself and, as a matter of fact, adduces a number of reasons in its defense which coincide with the author's own position in this respect and are therefore not considered separately here because of the limitation in time. Those interested in Mackey's argument are therefore referred to the above mentioned publication (cf. bibliographical references, below).

Finally, the question of what bilinguality is seeking to accomplish may also be answered in the context of Mackey's study where he argues that

> What dominates most of this language alternation is the need to communicate or the desire to please . . . . Functionally bilingual children will soon know the dominant language of the teacher and use his language when speaking to him in or out of class. This respect or unconscious reaction to the other person's dominant language is transferred to the child's behavior outside the class. . . . This pattern of free alternation is found not only in class. . . . it is, in fact, the bilingual

> pattern of the community, it is a form of receptive bilingualism in free variation. (1972:67-68)

Mackey's conceptualization of the concurrent bilingual program, even though it was observed in a German experimental school, can also be made to apply to the prevailing situation in many parts of the Southwest, particularly in South Texas, but with one reservation, that of free variation. Contrary to the situation in West-Berlin where nationals of different European countries and the United States share mutual experiences, in the Southwest it is a situation in which a minority population -- often a majority population on the local perspective -- seeks to find a viable means of co-existence with the dominant population in spite of socio-economic, cultural or ethnic differences. This situation does obviously not allow in our communities for bilingualism in free variation but rather suggests the presence of a series of verbal interaction patterns where the choice of one language over the other can usually be rationalized and also be justified. This lack of free variation in interethnic interaction, however, does not invalidate the concurrent approach. Quite to the contrary, it brings into the classroom the verbal strategy that characterizes bilinguals but that schools usually tried to condemn.

2. Some Socio-Cultural and Linguistic Implications

In view of the detailed discussion in the previous section concerning the implementation of a bilingual education program, the author can be reasonably brief in his comments about socio-cultural and linguistic implications for the concurrent approach. In effect, he will restate, from a more socio-linguistically-geared vantage point, some of the earlier arguments and consider, within such a framework, issues like the teaching of content, the teacher, the language distribution and the community and their roles in the education of bilinguals.

The teaching of content in two languages, and not the development of language skills, must be considered the crux of bilingual education, however programs will differ from one another to the extent to which either the transition to monolingual learning or the maintenance of bilingual learning may be the goal. As for the transitional model, bilingual education addresses itself to the minority child in an area where his ethnic group is outnumbered by the mainstream population. It is an attempt, ideally speaking, on part of the Government, to facilitate social and economic mobility, immersion into and assimilation to the middle class culture of our society and is, therefore, designed to overcome the problems that poverty and isolation are bound to cause to the members of the least prestigious urban as well as rural populations. As for the maintenance model, bilingual education -- better called the education of bilinguals -- is oriented toward the minority child in an area where the minority often constitutes the majority population at the local perspective. It seeks to reach the child in the vernacular as well as the dominant language and does it in the expectation that continued bilinguality, at both the literate and the colloquial level, will ultimately provide him with a means to function in the two cultures. Whereas in the first type of bilingual education, the teacher helps the child acquire information and knowledge by teaching him and interacting with him, during his early school years, in the vernacular language, it is in the last type of bilingual education, in the education for bilinguals, that the teacher exposes the child in a more permanent form to the different areas of content, either in one language or the other or in both.

The target population of bilingual education is, more often than not, the child from the lower socio-economic classes but should, ideally, also include the middle class child from any ethnic extraction, in particular from the

white middle class[5], to also allow the latter to become exposed to and to comprehend the social, cultural and linguistic traits of some of America's minority groups. Such exposure is expected to produce in all of them a desirable change in attitude favoring mutual understanding rather than ethnocentrism and stereotyping.

The teacher, regardless of her own ethnic background, is expected to adjust to the overall structure of each particular bilingual education program, either leaning toward acculturation or toward maintenance, as the region may suggest. Bilinguals as well as monolinguals in teams of two can can serve this purpose but when teaching bilingual children in a maintenance-oriented school, the teacher should be bilingual herself to set an example of functional bilinguality.

The language distribution also depends on the ultimate goal of the program in question. The separation of languages serves well to implement the transitional approach, whereas the concurrent use of the two languages is aimed at the maintenance of both languages and cultures. To justify the latter, it is useful to think that just as the monolingual learns and functions in the one language that he knows, the bilingual learns and functions in both of them. Hence, it is the two languages that are his medium of communication and the single-language approach is unlikely to produce the desired separation of the two languages. The teacher who seeks to accomplish the latter may contribute to the bilingual child's knowing neither language well.

Finally, the community must be viewed as a crucial element within the bilingual education program because it is, in the last instance, the community that determines whether bilingualism shall or shall not survive.

---

(5) Contrary to the view of some, I am here conceiving of the white child as belonging to one of our ethnic groups rather than as a non-ethnic.

No bilingual education program can hope to succeed, at the long run, unless the community itself shares the same verbal strategies that the school is trying to preserve or reinforce. The parental involvement has therefore become an important factor in many programs although there does not appear to be -- at least not yet -- a clear conception in regard to what parents or the community in general can actually contribute to the program. Community members are therichest resource that a school can find to identify its culture. To utilize parents merely as teachers' aides may serve to reduce the working load of teachers and administrators but fails to enrich culturally and sociologically the bilingual program.

To conclude the author is proposing a set of criteria that may be useful to consider in connection with the design of a workable bilingual program:

(1) Bilingual education must be distinguished from ESL (English as a Second Language) and SSL (Spanish as a Second Language) but the two may be considered preliminary steps to achieve bilingualism;

(2) The education of bilinguals differs from bilingual education in general in that it is restricted to predominantly bilingual settings and does not strive for assimilation into the dominant culture but rather for the maintenance of the vernacular and the co-existence with the mainstream culture;

(3) Bilingual education in the general sense is basically one of transition and is restricted to essentially monolingual settings;

(4) Bilingual teaching and, by the same token, bilingual learning must closely correlate with the community's verbal behavior which may be bilingual or monolingual and could therefore be striving for the maintenance of the two languages or the loss of the ethnic language;

(5) Bilingual verbal behavior may be random or domain-oriented but

in either case the bilingualism is stable as long as both languages are functionally important in the community, that is, as long as bilinguals will interact with both kinds of monolinguals;

(6) Bilingual learning usually implies learning in any one of the two languages regardless of whether the teaching was done in one or in the other language;

(7) Bilinguality implies biculturality but the reverse does not hold true because the person who is culturally different may only speak some variety of the language spoken by the mainstream of the American population;

(8) The bilingual's self-respect rises or falls according to the degree of acceptability that is afforded to his ethnic language; and

(9) The bilingual education that is meant to achieve assimilation may help overcome poverty but the education of bilinguals achieves, in addition, a means of coping with cultural diversity and linguistic loyalty.

3. The Concurrent Approach

The concurrent use of the bilingual's two languages may be controversial as the discussion in Section 1 has shown but, for the author, the pros outweigh the cons and the strongest argument in its favor is the fact that, regardless of the language of instruction, the bilingual will always resort to both languages in the learning process as well as in his out-of-school interactions. It therefore makes a great deal of sense that we are taking advantage of his linguistic versatility so that he may better perform in doing his school tasks.

The designer of a bilingual education program usually includes, among the statements of objectives, the need for "bilingual teaching" but without clarifying in detail what the nature of such a strategy is. Therefore, it is necessary to work toward greater specifity in regard to the distribution

of the bilingual's two languages. It is the objective of the present Section to suggest, in the context of the concurrent use of the two languages, some guidelines concerning the when and the how of linguistic alternation. These guidelines are intended to avoid the randomness of language alternation which in the past was a characteristic trait of the concurrent approach. This apparent randomness must have been the underlying motive for their objection to the approach, when Andersson and his Associates warned their readers that "the chief difficulty, as far as time is concerned, is in actually achieving the desired time distribution in all subjects and activities." (1970:100) More than merely being a problem of time distribution, it seems to be one of justification. In other words, how can we actually explain the appropriateness of code-shifting in any given instance? Only if we can do that, will we overcome the randomness of the alternation. This in turn can be achieved by helping teachers become more language-conscious and by suggesting ways to analyze the social situations in which they engage when they interact with their students. Metaphorically speaking, we want teachers to be sociolinguists, that is, to analyze the speech situation in the classroom in order for them to determine when it is or when it may be appropriate or meaningful to shift from one language to the other. It is then here assumed that certain identifiable features in the speech situation can serve as cues for the teacher or the student to trigger a shift in code. With this in mind, the author has identified sixteen situational variants that are intended to suggest to the teacher that it may now be appropriate for her to accept the student's code-shifting strategy or to engage herself in one.

These sixteen situational variants or cues are described in the remainder of the paper. Each cue description is followed by at least two

interactional item or mini-dialog to illustrate the way in which the language switch can be incorporated into a lesson or into an out-of-class student-teacher interaction. Eventually, the description of an entire lesson, rather than merely that of the switching process, should be included but this would go beyond the scope of this presentation.

Cue A : Variable Language Dominance

Language switch may occur to (a) ensure better comprehension or (b) to promote language development. In other words, the teacher may wish to switch to the other language, if she believes that she can make herself better understood this way or else she may do so, if she feels that her students would profit from it to become more proficient in the other language. The other language might be the vernacular or the dominant language, depending upon whether we are dealing with a minority language dominant or an English dominant child.

(1) T[6] : How many seconds are there in a minute?
S : (silence)
T : ¿Cuántos segundos hay en un minuto?
S : ¿Son las bolitas del reloj? Sixty. (Mary Sue Miranda)

(2) T : George, can you name two months of the year?
S : February and May.
T : Good. Febrero y mayo son dos meses del año. (Lilia Luna)

Cue B : The Intimacy-Formality Spectrum

A language switch may occur as a result of the speaker's analysis of the social situation. The more intimate or personal the message, the greater the possibility that the stronger language is chosen as medium of communication. Hence, if the interaction between teacher and students was in the weaker language while impersonal matters were discussed, the chance is that the student will switch to the stronger language in a more personal conversation or else he may opt for not continuing to talk altogether.

(3) S : Good morning, teacher.
T : Good morning. Did you have a nice weekend?
S : Oh, yeah. Vinieron todos mis primos y tíos a vernos.
T : ¡Que bueno! ¿Y que hicieron? ¿Se quedaron en tu casa?
S : Si, unos hasta tuvieron que dormir en el piso. (Mary Sue Miranda)

---

(6) The 39 items or mini-dialogs have been selected from a larger corpus and were all written by students and teachers who volunteered to participate in the project. Each item is accompanied by the name of its writer. In some cases the item has been revised by this author to bring out a point more effectively. The following letters identify the hypothetical interlocutors: T (teacher), S (student), A (aide), ML (monolingual) and BL (bilingual).

(4) T : Did you bring your money for the trip to the zoo?
S : No.
T : ¿Por qué no?
S : Porque a mi papá no le pagaron esta semana. (Mary Sue Miranda, revised)

(5 T : Why weren't you in Oral Language yesterday?
S : Because of things that happenened at my house.
T : ¿Qué pasó en tu casa?
S : Mi hermanita se enfermó y se la llevaron al hospital. Por eso no pudo venir mi mamá. (Leticia Rubio)

Cue C : Vernacular as opposed to Dominant Domains

This cue resembles the previous one except for its closer relationship to social institutions and the language choice appropriate for each institution. In other words, a speaker may, within a basically vernacular situation, act more intimately or more formally, that is more socially distant. On the other hand, a speaker tends to make a language choice depending upon whether the message is concerned with matters relative to institutions like the home, the church, the school, the job, the neighborhood, etc. There seems to be a consensus that the vernacular language is more appropriate in the home, the neighborhood but not at the job or in school. This cue, then, serves to determine the language appropriateness in accordance with the domain selected.

(6) T : Tomorrow we start quarter exams.
A : Oh yes. Well, the tests are ready.
T : Oye, ¿cómo te gusta tu nueva casa?
A : Pues, mucho porque está más grande y la yarda es más grande para que jueguen los niños. (Herminia Aquinaga)

(7) T : Where were you yesterday? This note says you were sick. ¿Qué te pasó?
S : Tenía que llevar mi mamá al doctor.
T : Well, you missed a test.
S : Yes, I know. Can I take it tomorrow? I haven't studied for it.
T : Do you remember what material it was going to include?
S : No. Voy a preguntárselo a mi carnal; él está en la clase también. (Patricia Long, revised)

(8) T : What is your favorite food in the cafeteria?
S : Hamburgers.
T : ¿Y en tu casa?
S : Tacos de pollo.

Cue D : Lexical Enrichment

This cue produces a teacher-initiated language switch with the objective of developing the child's communicative skills to talk about a given topic also in the other language. In other words, if the teacher is uncertain that her students

can argue about a topic in Spanish, whereas they have no difficulty in discussing it in English, she may choose to engage in language switch and thus expand the child's special vocabulary in some specific directions.

(9) T : Pablo, explain the addition of two's.
S : I can't.
T : Si puedes. Te acuerdas de la canción que estabas diciendo ayer? Dicela a los otros. (Roberto A. Trevino)

(10) T : ¿Que son unas de las características de los pájaros?
S : No se.
T : You know some of the characteristics of birds.
S : Yes, they all have wings, beaks, two legs and feathers. (Raul L. Perez)

(11) T : Cuántas clases de comida hay?
S : No sé.
T : Hay cuatro clases. Do you know which they are?
S : Oh, yes, the milk, meat, vegetable and fruit and bread groups. (Clara Utley, revised)

Cue E : Translatability

This cue resembles the previous one in that it also carries the conversation into the other language. The objective here, however, is not the broadening of vocabulary knowledge but the ability of the child to restate a whole argument in the other language. The purpose of the language switch could at times be an as much as possible literal translation and at other times a free translation. Although translation practices as the only element of bilingual teaching are unacceptable, as one of many different practices, they are valuable, particularly in view of the fact that many bilinguals who have learned both languages simultaneously or almost so are usually at a loss to make the transfer to the other language when asked to restate their arguments.

(12) T : Birds migrate to the South during winter time.
S : What does "migrate" mean?
T : Que vuelan a otro lugar. Los pájaros vuelan al sur en el invierno.
S : ¿Por qué?
T : Porque allí hace mas calor que en el norte. (Clara Utley, revised)

(13) T : Alberto, please read from the book the rule on gravity for the class.
S : "All objects with weight will fall in a downward motion due to the gravitational pull of the earth."
T : Do you understand what you read? Say it in Spanish.
S : Todos los objetos que tengan peso caeran en mocion vertical debido a la fuerza de gravidad de la tierra. (Roberto A. Trevino, revised)

Cue F : Capturing of Attention

A language switch may be appropriate to capture the attention of students whom the teacher is at a point of losing or, even though he is not at the point of losing the students' attention, to stress a particular point. This point of brief language switch has been referred to in the literature as metaphorical shifting and is actually the embedding of an utterance in Language B into the discourse in Language A.

(14) T : Be prepared for a quiz on Friday.
S : Did you say we are going to have a quiz Friday?
T : Si, el viernes tendremos el examen sobre la lectura de hoy. Please take careful notes on persons' names, places and dates.
(Maria D. Gonzalez)

(15) T : ¿Qué modos de transportación [sic] hay?
S : El aeroplano y el tren.
T : ¿Qué mas?
S : (silence)
T : How did you come to school this morning?
S : In a car. (Victoria De La Garza, revised)

(16) T : What kind of story did we just finish reading?
S : It was a poem, Ma'am.
T : No es una poesía, es una fábula. Now, what did this fable teach us.
S : That we should not lie because it does not pay.
(Blanca Rangel, revised)

Cue G : Review

Obviously, all lessons must be reviewed at one time or another. Review time may thus be considered a cue to switch languages. Rather than restating the lesson or even summarizing it in the language in which it was taught, the review done in the other language will avoid boredom for those who comprehended it the first time and facilitate comprehension to those who did not or did only incompletely understand the material.

(17) T : In the story, Thomas was lost in the jungle. Remember? ¿Qué es que encontró Tomás en la selva?
S : Un tigre y muchos pájaros.
T : ¿Y donde hizo su casa Tomás? (Victoria De La Garza)

(18) T : When we went to the library last week, I explained how you can find a book that you need. Primero se busca el título, el tema o el nombre del autor del libro en el fichero. En la ficha encuentras el número de identificación del libro .... (Rene Ornelas)

Cue H : The Stronger Language

It is relatively easy to determine which of the bilingual's two languages is the weaker and which the stronger one, unless he is a fully balanced bilingual. If a person addresses us in his weaker language, we often feel compelled, in order to please our interlocutor, to shift to his stronger language. This respect for the interlocutor's language competency is an important communicative strategy worth implementing more consistently. Hence, the recognition of a less than perfect language competency when talking to an individual will produce language switch.

(19) T : Do you like to go to your grandfather's house?
S : Si. Me gusta mucho ir a casa de mi abuelito.
T : ¿Cuándo fué la última vez que fuiste allí? (Clara Utley)

(20) T : The day after tomorrow is Friday.
S : ¿Mañana es viernes?
T : No, pasado mañana. (Mary Sue Miranda, revised)

Cue I : Language Choice as Preference or Random Behavior

A speaker may shift to the other language because he prefers it as a medium of communication or else he may do it for no apparent reason. Obviously, not every instance of language switch can be justified rationally. This is especially true for an area of unstable bilingualism. And yet, the feeling that any interlocutor is free to use the language that he wishes to choose is an important one, especially if he is not equally competent in the two languages. The assurance that it is all right to use the language of his choice will contribute to a greater willingness to participate in the speech event; in other words, he will ask questions and give answers whenever he feels like doing so. On the other hand, the speaker may be emotionally attached to one of his two languages and take advantage of using it whenever he can. For the observer it may be difficult to determine whether it is a matter of preference or one of random behavior, unless he knows the speaker sufficiently well. Therefore, the language switch may assume roughly the same appearance, leaving it up to the observer to identify the motive for the switch one way or the other.

(21) T : María, tu vestido es muy bonito.
S : Thank you, my mother did it herself.
T : A mi me gusta coser también. (Renee Molak)

(22) T : Who can tell me where the story took place?
S : In London.
T : What else can you tell me about London?
S : En Londres siempre llueve. (Maria D. Gonzalez)

Cue J : Content

This cue is the most obvious of all. If the subject matter can be related to persons or objects of the Spanish-speaking world, it is better discussed in Spanish. By the same token, if it relates to persons or objects of the English-speaking world, English is the better medium of communication.

(23) T : There are always five or six mariachi in a group.
S : ¿Qué instrumentos tocan?
T : La guitara, el violin, la trompeta y el guitarón.
(Clara Utley, revised)

(24) S : Todavía hay curanderos en San Antonio.
T : Did you know that Anglos used to have 'curanderos' too?
S : Really, sir?
T : Sure. On the old days bargers did the work of doctors. Today, Anglos go to the drugstore and get all kinds of colored things in bottles that don't work. (David Plylar, revised)

(25) T : Who is the president of the U.S.
S : Mr. Ford is the president.
T : Y quien es Luis Echevarría?
S : El presidente de Mexico. (Caroline Myer)

Cue K : Texts

In any bilingual program some school texts are likely to be printed in one language and others, in the other language. The language of a given text may

serve as a cue in regard to the choice of the language in which this text is to be discussed.

(26) T : What is the title of the story you read for today.
S : Los Indios de San Antonio.
T : ¿Donde vivían los indios?
S : Vivian en las misiones.
T : ¿En cuales misiones? (Raul L. Perez)

(27) T : Are you through reading?
S : Yes. Es una historia muy interesante pero un tanto complicada.
T : El autor hace un magnífico estudio psicológico, ¿no te parece?
(Beatrice Duffer)

Cue L : Monolinguals

This cue is remindful of Cue H in that the language switch is triggered by the language competence of the interlocutor. This time it is not the recognition of the weaker language that determines the switch but rather the realization of the fact that the individual does not speak at all the language that, at this moment, is the medium of communication.

(28) BL_1 : Allí me quedé parado sin poder hablar.
BL_2 : Y luego, ¿que le pasó?
ML : What did he say?
BL_1 : ¿Qué quiere él?
BL_2 : Quiere saber que pasó pero háblale en inglés.
BL_1 : Oh well, I was at this party . . . . . (Lance Rodriguez)

(29) BL_1 : ¿Fuiste al cine ayer?
BL_2 : Sí. Fui a ver "Jaws." ¡Qué película!
ML : Hi everybody. What's new?
$BL_{1/2}$: We are discussing "Jaws." Have you seen it? (Herminia Aguiñaga)

(30) BL : Hey, sir. ¿Es su jefita tan fea como dice José?
ML : What?
BL : I said, are you giving us a math test today?
ML : Oh sí, sí.

Cue M : Misbehavior

Children tend to misbehave and their action may require reprimanding by the teacher. If, when the misbehavior occurs, the teacher teaches the class in the child's weaker language, the language switch to the child's stronger language may be warranted. Once the child has been disciplined, the teacher may wish to shift back to the language in which the lesson was intended.

(31) T : The office wishes to find out how many students in each homeroom have parents in the armed services.
S : (passing a note)

T : Manuel, deje de estarse moviendo y ponga mas atención. Please, raise your hand to indicate if your parents are in the service. (Roberto A. Treviño)

(32) T : Can anybody remember why Judy didn't want to go to her grandfather's farm?
S : (tries to hit a little girl)
T : Si no te portas bien, Carlos, no saldrás al recreo. Remember, children, that Judy didn't want to go because she was afraid of the bull. (Maria D. Gonzalez)

(33) T : Entonces, ésta es la bandera de México.
S : (playing with an eraser on his desk)
T : John, clear off your desk and pay attention.
S : Los colores son rojo, blanco y verde. (Renee Molak)

Cue N : Fatigue

It is usually not difficult to discover instances of fatigue in a person, whether it is the result of physical or emotional strain. Under fatigue, the individual seeks not to add another strain, such as speaking the weaker language but resorts to a verbal strategy (the stronger language) that allows the fatigue to wear off. Children from broken homes who experience emotional fatigue or those others who are physically fatigued may all wish to engage in language switch in favor of their stronger language. Teachers who detect fatigue may take it as a cue to shift from one to the other language.

(34) T : Can you tell me, Janie, how much 5 times 8 is?
S : (uncooperative) I dunno.
T : Si te doy ocho lápices cada día por cinco días, ¿cuantos tendrás?
S : Cuarenta. (Victoria De La Garza, revised)

(35) T : Eleanor, have you finished your work?
S : No, my eyes are hurting me.
T : ¿Por qué? ¿Estás cansada? A lo mejor necesitas anteojos. (Herminia Aguinaga, revised)

Cue O : Personal Rapport

In all the instances of language switch suggested above, the transition has been from all-English to all-Spanish but not to a Tex-Mex or Spanglish variety of the language code. On the other hand, there must be situations, especially in out-of-class interactions between teacher and students, where the teacher is seeking a very close relationship, that is, some personal rapport, with a given student. The mixid variety of the code is likely to promote this personal rapport if in this area language mixing is the natural way of carrying on informal and intimate speech among peers, kins or individuals who seek close relationship.

(36) A : ¿Andas shopping, Margarita?
B : No, vine a comprar un gift para un birthday party.
A : ¿Oh, si? ¡Que bien! Hay te watcho. (Herminia Aguinaga)

(37) S : ¿Podemos ir al "library?"
T : Ok. Vayan al "library" and get a good book pero don't stop at the telephone para gossipiar.
S : 'ta güeno. Let me get a pass to go but la vieja no nos va a dejar venirnos when we finish. (Roberto A. Trevino)

Cue Q : Low Prestige of Code

To consistently avoid the use of one language and exclusively favor another language, usually the dominant language, is an indication that the speaker holds one of the language in low esteem. Within a bilingual teaching situation -- or a bilingual setting in general -- it is important that equal value be assigned to either language. The teacher who experiences a negative attitude toward one of the codes on the part of his students may engage in language shift in order to show rather than to argue that both languages are equally acceptable.

(38) T : Carlos, ¿tu hablas español en la casa con tus papas y hermanos?
S : Sometimes I speak Spanish but mostly English.
T : ¿Como se llaman tu mamá y tu papá?
S : My mother's name is Constancia y my dad's name is Ricardo. (Maria D. Gonzalez)

(39) T : Samuel, ¿a donde naciste?
S : In Harlingen, Texas.
T : ¿Cuántos años tienes?
S : I'm 22.
T : ¿Tu si hablas español?
S : Yes, of course.
T : Pues, háblame en español. Quiero oirte.
S : Te voy a contar un chiste en español. Un dia un viejo se fué de viaje . . . . . (Ed Huffman)

6. Conclusion

It has been the objective of this paper to show that bilingual education may vary in nature depending upon the community's -- or the school district's -- orientation in regard to social patterning, cultural identification or language use. Given the socio-cultural and linguistic conditions prevailing in most parts of South Texas and the communicative behavior patterns of its predominantly bilingual population, the author hopes that he was able to show that the concurrent approach is the most feasible one for this region, since it enacts the actual communicative patterns of this society.

It has been a further objective of the paper to offer specific guidelines that suggest how the language alternation can systematically be implemented as a

result of the teacher's painstaking analysis of the social situation in the classroom. The sixteen cues with their corresponding items or mini-dialogs were intended to serve as illustrations that the concurrent approach is indeed a feasible one and, furthermore, to show that code-shifting can be justified in almost all instances. Thus, its adoption as a classroom strategy would render the verbal performance at school a most natural and resourceful means of teaching a school subject to bilingual children.

Bibliography

Andersson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer. 1970. Bilingual Schooling in the United States, 2 vols. Southwest Educational Laboratory, Austin, Texas.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1974. A Sociology of Bilingual Education. Final report for the Division of Foreign Studies, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1975. The Dilemma of Bilingual Education Models: Duplication or Compartmentalization. in Burt and Dulay, eds., On TESOL '75, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Washington, D.C.

_____ 1974. Title VII Bilingual Education Program: Evaluation of Program and Recommendations. Unpublished report. United Independent School District, Laredo, Texas.

_____ 1975. Title VII Bilingual Education Program. Evaluation of Program and Recommendations. Unpublished report. United Independent School District, Laredo, Texas.

Mackey, William Francis. 1972. Bilingual Education in a Binational School. Newbury House Publishers, Rowley, Massachusetts.

United States Commission on Civil Rights Clearinghouse. 1975. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education, Publication 51, Washington, D.C.